UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/162,685	09/29/1998	HOWARD JUSTIN GLASER	ST9-98-052	9128

22462 7590 07/08/2003

GATES & COOPER LLP
HOWARD HUGHES CENTER
6701 CENTER DRIVE WEST, SUITE 1050
LOS ANGELES, CA 90045

EXAMINER	
BASHORE, WILLIAM L	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	17

DATE MAILED: 07/08/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/162,685	GLASER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	William L. Bashore	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *28 February 2003* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-34* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-34* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: appeal brief filed 2/28/2003, to the present application filed **9/29/1998**.

2. The objection of claims 2, 13, 24 under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim, has been withdrawn by the examiner.

3. The rejection of claims 1-8, 11-19, 22-30, 33-34 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Foley, Arora, and Francis, has been withdrawn as necessitated by newly found art.

4. The rejection of claims 9-10, 20-21, 31-32 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Foley, Arora, Francis, and Lisle, has been withdrawn as necessitated by newly found art.

5. Claims 1-34 are pending. Claims 1, 12, 23, 34 are independent claims. The finality of the previous Office Action mailed 10/2/2002 (paper 14) has been withdrawn in view of newly found art.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. **The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:**

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. **Claims 1-2, 4, 11-13, 15, 22-24, 27, 33-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over HTMLed (hereinafter HTMLed), 4/26/1997 by Internet Software Technologies, downloaded on 6/27/2003, from <http://www.winsite.com>, screenshots pages 1-9.**

In regard to independent claim 1, HTMLed teaches an HTML editor comprising a Form Designer for creating/editing a form to be integrated within an HTML page (HTMLed page 3). The Form Designer allows a user to initially drag and drop various form elements onto a designer field as shown by the example created form (HTMLed page 5). After pressing "OK", the code responsible for creating the form is transferred (associated) with a newly created HTML file (sample.htm) (HTMLed page 6). When sample.htm is reopened and/or previewed in Netscape via "Test with Netscape" option (HTMLed page 7-8), the form elements described by Form Designer are defined in sample.htm, which in turn are defined in the page produced in Netscape from said file, therefore displaying a relationship by at least viewing the HTML code (compare with claim 1 "*A method of displaying a relationship between an HTML file and an element from a form, wherein the element is in an HTML page, comprising:*").

HTMLed teaches a file (sample.htm) containing form control code, said sample.htm file can be reasonably interpreted by the skilled artisan as a project file, said sample.htm file containing form code information defining an association between the previously transferred form elements and the page rendered from said sample.htm file (HTMLed page 6; compare with claim 1 "*reading information from a project file, the information comprising a relationship between the element that has been transferred from the form to the HTML page and the HTML file associated with the HTML page;*").

HTMLed teaches creation of a customized form using a FORM Designer window, said window showing a spatial mapping of form elements (HTMLed page 5). Subsequent to pressing the "OK" button, the representative form code information is transferred (mapped) to an HTML file (sample.htm, see HTMLed page 6), the code also acting to preserve the spatial mapping of said elements (compare with claim 1 "*processing the information to map the element from the form to the HTML file;*").

HTMLed teaches display of a sample HTML file (sample.htm, see HTMLed page 6) comprising Form code, said form code showing an association between form elements (i.e. "Radio Button" is associated with the form), and said form code showing a relationship to an HTML file (i.e. the form code

is enclosed within sample.htm). The limitation of displaying a mapping would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, in view of HTMLed, because of HTMLed's disclosure of sample.htm, and of Form Designer. Since the form elements are associated (related) to the displayed form code block, and said form code block is associated (related) to sample.htm, the preservation of spatial mapping of form elements (HTMLed page 5), provides a reasonable suggestion to the skilled artisan to display the above associations, relations, and preserved spatial mappings as a displayed mapping of relationships, providing the benefit of mapping for a user to better visualize form relationships (compare with claim 1 "*displaying the mapping on a graphical user interface that indicates the relationship between the element, the form, and the HTML file.*").

In regard to dependent claim 2, HTMLed teaches creation of a customized form using a FORM Designer window, said window showing a spatial mapping of form elements (HTMLed page 5). Subsequent to pressing the "OK" button, the representative form code information is transferred (mapped) to an HTML file (for rendering as an HTML page), (sample.htm, see HTMLed page 6), the code also acting to preserve the spatial mapping of said elements when displayed in a Web browser.

In regard to dependent claim 4, HTMLed teaches an element name, and an HTML filename (HTMLed page 6 items sample.htm, and "Radio Button").

In regard to dependent claim 11, HTMLed teaches various editing buttons on a tool bar for modifying and saving into sample.htm (a project file).

In regard to independent claim 12, HTMLed teaches an HTML editor comprising a Form Designer for creating/editing a form to be integrated within an HTML page (HTMLed page 3). The Form Designer allows a user to initially drag and drop various form elements onto a designer field as shown by

the example created form (HTMLed page 5). After pressing "OK", the code responsible for creating the form is transferred (associated) with a newly created HTML file (sample.htm) (HTMLed page 6). When sample.htm is reopened and/or previewed in Netscape via "Test with Netscape" option (HTMLed page 7-8), the form elements described by Form Designer are defined in sample.htm, which in turn are defined in the page produced in Netscape from said file, therefore displaying a relationship by at least viewing the HTML code (compare with claim 12 "*A apparatus for displaying a relationship between an HTML file and an element from a form, wherein the element is in an HTML page, comprising:*").

HTMLed teaches a file (sample.htm) containing form control code, said sample.htm file can be reasonably interpreted by the skilled artisan as a project file, said sample.htm file containing form code information defining an association between the previously transferred form elements and the page rendered from said sample.htm file (HTMLed page 6; compare with claim 12 "*means for reading information from a project file, the information comprising a relationship between the element that has been transferred from the form to the HTML page and the HTML file associated with the HTML page;*").

HTMLed teaches creation of a customized form using a FORM Designer window, said window showing a spatial mapping of form elements (HTMLed page 5). Subsequent to pressing the "OK" button, the representative form code information is transferred (mapped) to an HTML file (sample.htm, see HTMLed page 6), the code also acting to preserve the spatial mapping of said elements (compare with claim 12 "*means for processing the information to map the element from the form to the HTML file;*").

HTMLed teaches display of a sample HTML file (sample.htm, see HTMLed page 6) comprising Form code, said form code showing an association between form elements (i.e. "Radio Button" is associated with the form), and said form code showing a relationship to an HTML file (i.e. the form code is enclosed within sample.htm). The limitation of displaying a mapping would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, in view of HTMLed, because of HTMLed's disclosure of sample.htm, and of Form Designer. Since the form elements are associated (related) to the displayed form code block, and said form code block is associated (related) to sample.htm, the

preservation of spatial mapping of form elements (HTMLed page 5), provides a reasonable suggestion to the skilled artisan to display the above associations, relations, and preserved spatial mappings as a displayed mapping of relationships, providing the benefit of mapping for a user to better visualize form relationships (compare with claim 12 "*a display for presenting the mapping on a graphical user interface that indicates the relationship between the element, the form, and the HTML file.*").

In regard to claims 13, 15, 22, claims 13, 15, 22 reflect the apparatus comprising computer readable instructions used to perform the methods as claimed in claims 2, 4, 11, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to independent claim 23, HTMLed teaches an HTML editor comprising a Form Designer for creating/editing a form to be integrated within an HTML page (HTMLed page 3). The Form Designer allows a user to initially drag and drop various form elements onto a designer field as shown by the example created form (HTMLed page 5). After pressing "OK", the code responsible for creating the form is transferred (associated) with a newly created HTML file (sample.htm) (HTMLed page 6). When sample.htm is reopened and/or previewed in Netscape via "Test with Netscape" option (HTMLed page 7-8), the form elements described by Form Designer are defined in sample.htm, which in turn are defined in the page produced in Netscape from said file, therefore displaying a relationship by at least viewing the HTML code (compare with claim 23 "*An article of manufacture, embodying logic to perform a method of displaying a relationship between an HTML file and an element that has been transferred from a form to an HTML page, the method comprising:*").

HTMLed teaches a file (sample.htm) containing form control code, said sample.htm file can be reasonably interpreted by the skilled artisan as a project file, said sample.htm file containing form code information defining an association between the previously transferred form elements and the page rendered from said sample.htm file (HTMLed page 6; compare with claim 23 "*reading information from*

a project file, the information comprising a relationship between the element that has been transferred from a form to an HTML page and the HTML file associated with the HTML page;").

HTMLed teaches creation of a customized form using a FORM Designer window, said window showing a spatial mapping of form elements (HTMLed page 5). Subsequent to pressing the "OK" button, the representative form code information is transferred (mapped) to an HTML file (sample.htm, see HTMLed page 6), the code also acting to preserve the spatial mapping of said elements (compare with claim 23 "*processing the information to map the element from the form to the HTML file;*").

HTMLed teaches display of a sample HTML file (sample.htm, see HTMLed page 6) comprising Form code, said form code showing an association between form elements (i.e. "Radio Button" is associated with the form), and said form code showing a relationship to an HTML file (i.e. the form code is enclosed within sample.htm). The limitation of displaying a mapping would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, in view of HTMLed, because of HTMLed's disclosure of sample.htm, and of Form Designer. Since the form elements are associated (related) to the displayed form code block, and said form code block is associated (related) to sample.htm, the preservation of spatial mapping of form elements (HTMLed page 5), provides a reasonable suggestion to the skilled artisan to display the above associations, relations, and preserved spatial mappings as a displayed mapping of relationships, providing the benefit of mapping for a user to better visualize form relationships (compare with claim 23 "*displaying the mapping on a graphical user interface that indicates the relationship between the element, the form, and the HTML file.*").

In regard to claims 24, 26, 33, claims 24, 26, 33 reflect the article of manufacture comprising computer readable instructions used to perform the methods as claimed in claims 2, 4, 11, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

8. **Claims 3, 5, 14, 16, 25, 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over HTMLed (hereinafter HTMLed), 4/26/1997 by Internet Software Technologies, downloaded on 6/27/2003 from <http://www.winsite.com>, screenshots pages 1-9, in view of Nano WebEditor (hereinafter Namo), 8/19/1997 by Namo Interactive Inc., downloaded on 6/27/2003 from <http://www.winsite.com>, screenshots pages 1-8.**

In regard to dependent claim 3, HTMLed does not specifically teach a non-visual control selected from a group comprising a button, etc. However, Namo teaches a form design editor, whereby a hidden field can be selected for inclusion on a form, said hidden field selected via button "Hidden Field" (Namo page 4). It would have been obvious to on eof ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Namo to HTMLed, providing a user of HTMLed the benefit of hidden fields to provide information (i.e. statistical, etc.) hidden from a future user of said form.

In regard to dependent claim 5, HTMLed does not specifically teach a form name. However, Namo teaches a form design editor, whereby a form can be given a name (Namo page 4 item "Form Name"). It would have been obvious to on eof ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Namo to HTMLed, providing a user of HTMLed the benefit of form names to differentiate between multiple forms.

In regard to claims 14, 16, claims 14, 16 reflect the apparatus comprising computer readable instructions used to perform the methods as claimed in claims 3, 5, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to claims 25, 27, claims 25, 27 reflect the article of manufacture comprising computer readable instructions used to perform the methods as claimed in claims 3, 5, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

9. **Claims 6-8, 17-19, 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over HTMLed (hereinafter HTMLed), 4/26/1997 by Internet Software Technologies, downloaded on 6/27/2003 from <http://www.winsite.com>, screenshots pages 1-9, in view of Arora et al. (hereinafter Arora), U.S. Patent No. 5,911,145 issued June 1999 (cited in a previous action).**

In regard to dependent claim 6, HTMLed teaches element names (i.e. names associated with graphical elements and images), and HTML file names. HTMLed does not specifically teach said names presented in a row of a table. However, Arora teaches an HTML editor, whereby a portion of an HTML page is shown, including various graphical buttons (Arora Figure 22 item 2202, also column 10 lines 18-40). Arora Figure 42 depicts the assets of said page depicted in rows and columns of a table regarding the related files, links, and objects for said page, the items in each column related to the HTML filename representing the page in Figure 22 (Arora Figure 42, also column 14 lines 33-36). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Arora to HTMLed, providing HTMLed the benefit of visually itemizing the mapping of files and their locations, to the forms of HTMLed.

In regard to dependent claim 7, claim 7 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 6, and in further view of the following, is rejected along the same rationale.

HTMLed does not specifically teach cells of a table. However, Arora teaches cells for entry of a mapping (Arora Figure 39). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

the invention to apply Arora to HTMLed, providing HTMLed the benefit of showing space and relationships in a visually organized fashion.

In regard to dependent claim 8, claim 8 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 6, and is rejected using the Examiner's argument and rationale as set forth in the rejection of dependent claim 6.

In regard to claims 17-19, claims 17-19 reflect the apparatus comprising computer readable instructions used to perform the methods as claimed in claims 6-8, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to claims 28-30, claims 28-30 reflect the article of manufacture comprising computer readable instructions used to perform the methods as claimed in claims 6-8, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

10. **Claims 9-10, 20-21, 31-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over HTMLed (hereinafter HTMLed), 4/26/1997 by Internet Software Technologies, downloaded on 6/27/2003 from <http://www.winsite.com>, screenshots pages 1-9, in view of Lisle et al. (hereinafter Lisle), U.S. Patent No. 6,069,630 issued May 2000 (cited in a previous action).**

In regard to dependent claim 9, HTMLed teaches an ACTION attribute, in which a URL is supplied (mapped) in the form code specifying a location to which contents of a form is submitted to elicit a response (HTMLed page 3 – middle of page, also page 5 item "Action"). HTMLed does not specifically teach flagging an invalid mapping. However, Lisle teaches the indication of a link depending

upon whether a link (element) is good or bad (Lisle Figure 4 item 410). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Lisle to HTMLed, providing HTMLed the benefit of providing an updated action URL for its form.

In regard to dependent claim 10, claim 10 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claims 1 and 9, and is rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to claims 20-21, claims 20-21 reflect the apparatus comprising computer readable instructions used to perform the methods as claimed in claims 9-10, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to claims 31-32, claims 31-32 reflect the article of manufacture comprising computer readable instructions used to perform the methods as claimed in claims 9-10, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

Response to Argument

11. Applicant's arguments filed 2/28/2002 as paper No.16, have been fully and carefully considered, but are moot in view of the new round(s) of rejections. Accordingly, this action is non-final.

Conclusion

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William Bashore whose telephone number is **(703) 308-5807**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 11:30 AM to 8:00 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Feild, can be reached on **(703) 305-9792**.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is **(703) 305-3900**.

13. **Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 746-7239 (for formal communications intended for entry)

or:

(703) 746-7240 (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

or:

(703) 746-7238 (for after-final communications)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Fourth Floor (Receptionist).

William L. Bashore
June 29, 2003

JOSEPH H. FEILD
PRIMARY EXAMINER